#### CP Text: The United States should permit people to buy handguns only after receiving a purchasing license. Connecticut is normal means. **Guo 15**[[1]](#footnote--1)

So in the summer of 1994, **lawmakers** hustled through a gun control bill in a special session. They **hoped to curb shootings by requiring people to get a purchasing license before buying a handgun. The state would issue these permits to people who passed a background check and a gun safety training course.** At the time, private citizens could freely buy and sell guns secondhand, even to those with criminal records. Connecticut’s law sought to regulate that market. Even private handgun sales would have to be reported to the state, and buyers would need to have a permit. Critics scoffed at the plan. They argued that a permit system would hassle lawful citizens, while crooks would still get guns on the black market. If the problem was criminals with guns, why not clean up crime instead of restricting guns? “This will not take one gun out of the hands of a single criminal,” State Rep. Richard Belden complained to [the New York Times](http://www.nytimes.com/1994/07/08/nyregion/connecticut-tightens-restrictions-on-gun-owners.html) in 1994. Even some supporters of the law, which took effect in 1995, called it a “[small step](http://www.nytimes.com/1994/07/08/nyregion/connecticut-tightens-restrictions-on-gun-owners.html)” — a gesture to placate residents alarmed at the gun violence. Now, two decades later, researchers at Johns Hopkins University and **the** University of California, Berkeley, say that Connecticut’s “permit-to-purchase” **law was** actually a **huge success for public safety.**

#### Empirics prove, the counterplan solves the aff and doesn’t link to the crime DA, there’s a predicted 40% reduction in homicides. Rudolph et al. 15[[2]](#footnote-0)

**We estimate the effect of Connecticut’s adoption of a handgun purchaser licensing law** in October 1995 **on** subsequent **homicides. Methods** We **compare Connecticut’s homicide rates after the law change to rates we would have expected if the law had not been adopted**, using the synthetic control method. To estimate the counterfactual and the law’s effect on homicide rates, we use longitudinal data from a weighted combination of comparison states identified based on the ability of pre-law homicide trends in those states to predict pre-law homicide trends in Connecticut. **We estimate that the law was associated with a 40% reduction in Connecticut’s firearm homicide rates during the first 10 years that the law was in place**. In contrast, there is no evidence for a reduction in nonfirearm homicides**.** Conclusions **Consistent with prior research**, this study demonstrates that Connecticut’s handgun purchaser licensing law is associated with a subsequent reduction in homicide rates. As would be expected if the reduction is driven by the law, the policy’s effects are only evident for homicides committed with firearms. 2 Homicide was the second leading cause of death for 15 to 34 year-olds in the United States from 1999 to 20111 and the second leading contributor to racial disparities in premature mortality among men.2 Firearms are used in more than two-thirds of homicides in the U.S.3 and firearm availability, especially to high-risk groups,4,5 is positively associated with homicide risks.6,7 Given the importance of firearms in lethal violence, many federal and state policies are designed to prevent individuals with a history of violence, criminal behavior, substance abuse, or serious mental illness from accessing firearms. Although federal law exempts private, unlicensed sellers from background check requirements, seventeen of the 50 states and the District of Columbia have their own background check requirements for firearm sales by unlicensed private sellers,8 and eleven have handgun purchaser licensing laws, also known as permit-to-purchase (PTP) laws. PTP laws require individuals to obtain a permit or license to purchase a handgun (from both licensed retail dealers and private sellers) that is contingent upon passing a background check. In eight states, individuals must apply for a PTP in person at the law enforcement agency initiating the background checks and issuing permits. In the other 42 states, pre-gun-sale background checks are initiated through a licensed gun dealer, although there is significant diversity among these policies. We conduct the current study to estimate the impact of Connecticut’s adoption of a PTP law in October 1995. Under this law, the state’s Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection accepts prospective handgun purchaser’s applications and fingerprints and, if the applicant passes the background check, issues permits to purchase handguns that are valid for 5 years

#### Doesn’t link to the constitution DA, It’s pretty clear – the counterplan is constitutional. Fuchs 13[[3]](#footnote-1)

Dear Gun Nuts and 2nd Amendment Absolutists, Over the weekend, in an op-ed for the Houston Chronicle, Vice President Joe Biden announced that the Administration was not going to give up background checks, and for good measure. According to Mayors Against Illegal Guns, in over 40 states, criminals (not law abiding gun owners) can legally avoid gun store background checks simply by purchasing their firearms at gun shows and through anonymous internet sales. I am not going to undertake a detailed analysis of the statistics, but if you are interested they can be found here. Suffice to say that although background check laws will never be able to prevent all illegal sales nor keep firearms away from all criminals (no law ever prevents all crime), for the most part they do work to keep guns away from those who shouldn’t have them. But, because of the lack of federal legislation on this issue, it is quite easy for a criminal to avoid one, simply by going to another state or a place where a background check is unnecessary. This needs to change. Unless and until we make background checks for gun sales that occur at gun shows and on the internet the law of the land, we will continue to see illegal firearms find their way into our cities and onto our streets. The issue is not dead, we are not going to let it die, because we are unwilling to see more of our children die instead. For the record, background checks are constitutional. Anyone who says otherwise is either uninformed or naive. If you want to know the truth about the constitutionality of background checks, simply **read the case law** on the subject. I am going to keep the legal stuff relatively short, since I am not in the mood to write (nor do I think you are in the mood to read) an entire synopsis of 2nd Amendment constitutional case law. However, it’s time to put the universal background checks issue to rest once and for all; **they are constitutional**. They are not an “infringement” that is so great such that they violate the 2nd Amendment. One needs to **look no further than DC v. Heller** (**the case that gun owners** like to **cite** to all the time **when discussing** that **they have an** individual **right to bear arms** and do not need to be part of a militia) to see that background checks are constitutional.  **“**Like most rights, **the right secured by the Second Amendment is not unlimited**… …Although we do not undertake an exhaustive historical analysis today of the full scope of the Second Amendment, **nothing** in our opinion **should be taken to** cast **doubt on** longstanding **prohibitions on the possession of firearms by felons and the mentally ill, or** laws forbidding the **carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools** and government buildings, or laws imposing conditions and qualifications on the commercial sale of arms.**“** This is not a terribly difficult concept to understand. One does not need to be a lawyer or a brain surgeon to get it. In fact, I’m pretty sure that if you asked a child to read the above paragraph they would be able to explain that what **the Supreme Court** has **said** is that **laws** which “infringe” on the 2nd Amendment **are** nonetheless **constitutional if they**: 1) Prohibit the possession of firearms by felons or the mentally ill (those adjudicated mentally ill by a court – not everyone who goes to the psychiatrist once a week), **or** 2) Forbid the carrying of firearms in certain places, or 3) **Impose conditions or qualifications on the sale of arms.** Hmmm… let’s think about this for a moment. Background checks do two of these things. They prohibit the possession of firearms by felons and/or those adjudicated mentally ill and they impose conditions/qualifications on the sale of arms. Thus, they are constitutional. How many times and in how many different ways does it need to be explained for some people to get it through their thick heads?

#### The coulnterplan doesn’t link to politics There’s broad based support for licenses. Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence 13[[4]](#footnote-2).

Public opinion polls show that **Americans strongly support licensing laws**.  A national survey conducted in January 2013 found that **77.3% of Americans (including 59.4% of gun owners**) **support requiring people to obtain a license from a** local **law enforcement agency before buying a gun to verify their identity and ensure that they are not legally prohibited from having a gun.**[4](http://smartgunlaws.org/licensing-of-gun-owners-purchasers-policy-summary/#footnote_3_5932) The licensing of handgun owners receives even more support, with 85% of respondents – including 73% of gun owners– in a 2001 nationwide poll favoring laws requiring handgun purchasers to obtain a permit before buying a handgun.[5](http://smartgunlaws.org/licensing-of-gun-owners-purchasers-policy-summary/#footnote_4_5932)  In that poll, 70% of the respondents mistakenly believed that a system of licensing and registration already exists.[6](http://smartgunlaws.org/licensing-of-gun-owners-purchasers-policy-summary/#footnote_5_5932) For information about registration laws, see our summary on the[Registration of Firearms](http://smartgunlaws.org/registration-of-firearms-policy-summary/).

#### Consensus of evidence shows gun bans doesn’t solve crime – instead increases it. Lott 01

John R. Lott, Jr (former Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law & Economics at the University of Chicago Law School; has held teaching positions at Yale University, the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Maryland, College Park; resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute from 2001 to 2006; chief economist at the United States Sentencing Commission; PhD in Economics, UCLA). “Guns, Crime, and Safety: Introduction.” Journal of Law and Economics, Vol. 44, No. S2, (October 2001), pp. 605-614. <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.gsu.edu/stable/10.1086/341243?seq=1&>

There is a vigorous debate over the relationship between guns and crime, with some pointing to the positive relationship between sales of a gun magazine, Guns & Ammo, and murder rates and others pointing to a negative relationship between survey data on gun ownership and various violent crime rates or the lack of a relationship between the sales of other gun magazines and crime.2 Cross‐country data are also brought into the controversy. Despite this discussion, to date, **there is no statistically significant evidence by academics that gun control laws** such as the federal Brady Act or assault weapons bans or state waiting periods, background checks, or one‐gun‐a‐month rules **reduce crime**. Some **evidence** even **indicates that these rules increase the crime rate**.3 In the debate **over** concealed **handgun laws**, the range of estimates using **panel data range from little** or no **reductions in violent crime to** fairly **large reductions in crime when law‐abiding citizens are allowed to carry concealed guns**. Indeed, the papers in this issue that examine this relationship all continue to report benefits and no costs from these laws. The results presented in this volume examining gun laws such as waiting periods, one‐gun‐a‐month rules, the Brady Act, and safe‐storage laws continue to confirm other studies that show gun control either has no effect or increases the crime rate. The papers examining the impact of gun laws on people’s safety do so from a variety of angles: cross‐country analysis relating gun laws to homicide rates (Jeffrey Miron), the impact of gun laws on the number of police deaths (David Mustard), the impact of juvenile gun possession on crime rates (Thomas Marvell), and the impact of gun laws on the number of accidental gun deaths and suicides by juveniles (myself and John Whitley).

#### Lott’s studies are the most reliable data on gun control. Lee 10

Timothy E. Lee (Senior Vice President of legal and public affairs at the Center for Individual Freedom). “John Lott: More Guns, Still Less Crime.” Center for Individual Freedom. 20 July 2010. <http://cfif.org/v/index.php/commentary/42-constitution-and-legal/686-john-lottmore-guns-still-less-crime>

We’ve now had a decade to digest More Guns, Less Crime. Twelve years can be long and cruel on watershed books, withering them beneath the harsh glare of events and critical analysis. By way of illustration, recall 1999’s Dow 36,000. Not so with More Guns, Less Crime. As stated by Dr. Lott and boldly noted in the preface to the new third edition, **not a single antagonist has refuted his empirical conclusion that more firearms result in reduced crime.** So what makes a third edition vital? What makes it a critical addition to Americans’ book collections? Plenty. **When** More Guns, Less Crime **[it] was initially published, only eighteen states possessed right-to-carry firearms laws. Today, that number [is]**ishas more than doubled to **thirty-nine states**. Obviously, **that** dramatic increase **provides an** even larger **base** of data **to test Lott**’s research. Further, the original edition examined sixteen years of data, 1977 through 1992. **The** third **edition now covers twenty-nine years**, which is particularly helpful since so many more states have adopted right-to-carry laws during that interim. Another reason that a third edition is essential is that **critics have had twelve years to critique Lott**’s proposition. As Lott states, however, “not a single refereed study finds the opposite result, that right-to-carry laws have a bad effect on crime.” Lott’s latest edition also addresses the impact of “Castle Doctrine” laws, which refer to the adage that “a man’s home is his castle” and make it unnecessary for potential crime victims to retreat as far as possible before using a firearm in self-defense. Also addressed by the new third edition is the federal “assault weapons” legislation, which took effect in 1994 but terminated in 2004. Gun control advocates predicted an explosion in murder and violent crime when the ban expired, but rates actually declined substantively. As Lott notes, “rarely do we get a chance to look at the impact of gun laws when they are first passed and then when they are eliminated.” In just the past two years, moreover, the United States Supreme Court has for the first time ruled on the long-debated issue of whether the Second Amendment protects an individual, as opposed to collective, right to keep and bear arms. Immediately following the Court’s District of Columbia v. Heller decision, the Washington, D.C. murder rate fell 25% (compared to a 7% nationwide reduction). Lott notes that the city of Chicago shows the opposite pattern, as the murder rate “exploded” after imposing its 1982 gun ban. In the new third edition, Lott also addresses the inefficacy of such things as waiting periods, mandatory trigger locks and gun show regulations. Each of these regulations raises obstacles for people to defend themselves, thereby making it easier for criminals to prey on weaker citizens with greater confidence. And, as noted above, Dr. **Lott has not encountered a single jurisdiction in the entire world where imposing gun control laws triggered a decline in murder rates.** The bottom line today, just as was true in 1998, is that “the very rules that seek to save lives can result in more deaths.” Dr. Lott has thus provided an invaluable service to America and the world audience generally. **Twelve years** ofadditional experience and **mountains of data confirm the empirical truth – more guns in the hands of law-abiding citizens mean less crime.**

#### Average citizens owning guns greatly decreases the risk of crime. Kates 13

Don B. Kates [Yale Law School] and Alice Marie Beard [J.D., George Mason University School of Law], “Murder, Self-Defense, and the Right to Arms,” Connecticut Law Review, Vol. 45, July 2013.

A statistician for the U.S. Justice Department’s National Crime Victimization Study estimates that when defending against rape, robbery, or assault, guns help 65% of the time and make things worse about 9% of the time. 34 There are hundreds of thousands of violent felonies annually. 35 Many Americans are armed, and handguns are used for self-defense millions of times per year. 36 **“[S]urveys reveal** a great deal of self-defensive use of firearms, in fact, **more defensive gun uses than crimes committed with firearms**.” 37 For instance, “**firearms are used over half a million times in a** typical year against **home invasion** burglars; usually the **burglar flees as soon as he finds out that the victim is armed, and no shot is ever fired.**” 38 Overwhelmingly when victims draw guns, criminals flee. **Criminals** flee armed citizens because they **want helpless victims, not gunfights** with armed ones. Indeed, 36 percent of the respondents **in [a study of imprisoned juvenile criminals**] reported having decided at least “a few times” not to commit a crime because they believed the potential victim was armed. **Seventy percent** of the respondents **reported having been “scared off**, shot at, wounded, or captured **by an armed** crime **victim**.” 39 Criminological studies conclude that “[r]esistance with a gun appears to be [the] most effective [response to criminal attack] in preventing serious injury [to victims, and] . . . for preventing property loss.” 40 As professors Hans Toch and Alan Lizotte write: [W]hen used for protection, **firearms** can **seriously inhibit aggression** and can provide a psychological buffer against the fear of crime. **Furthermore**, the fact that national **patterns show little violent crime where guns are most dense implies that guns do not elicit aggression in any meaningful way**. . . . Quite the contrary, these findings suggest that high saturations of guns in places, or something correlated with that condition, inhibit illegal aggression. 4
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